## JAN 8 7 205

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Sommers et al.

For

ZOOMABLE SPOT MODULE

Serial No.

09/683,395

Filed

December 21, 2001

Art Unit

2875

Examiner

Bertrand Zeade

Confirmation No.

2949

Allowed

November 22, 2004

..., \_\_\_,

Attorney Docket No.

GD-34

GLOZ 200081

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## RESPONSE TO REASONS FOR NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE

Dear Sir:

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of the claims in the present application. However, applicants must respectfully traverse the Examiner's Statements for Reasons for Allowance. In particular, reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." (37 CFR §104(e)(2001)). In the present case, applicant believes that the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance.

Mary Ann Temesvari

Further, while applicant believes that the claims are allowable because of the failure of the prior art to teach or suggest the combination of limitations, applicant does not acquiesce that the patentability resides in selective limitations, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Robert M. Sieg Reg. No. 54,446

1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216) 861-5582

 $L: \MAT\DATA\GLO\ response Notice Allowance. doc$